



# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/438,247	11/12/1999		JUNJI NISHIGAKI	15162/01290	9067
24367	7590	06/01/2006		EXAMINER	
SIDLEY A			KASSA, YOSEF		
717 NORTH HARWOOD SUITE 3400				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
DALLAS, TX 75201				2624	
				DATE MAIL ED: 06/01/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Surrey	09/438,247	NISHIGAKI ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	YOSEF KASSA	2624					
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailine earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 h	March 2006						
	s action is non-final.						
<i>'</i> —	,—						
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
	Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
	✓ Claim(s) <u>6-16</u> is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are rejected.	_						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
Application Papers	,						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10) The drawing(s) filed on 12 November 1999 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		7.03.07.07.01117.7.0 102.					
<u> </u>	. maioniko oradon 05 11 0 0 . 0 440(-)	(4) == (0					
a) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage					
Attachment(s)							
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da						
D	the same the						

Application/Control Number: 09/438,247 Page 2

Art Unit: 2624

#### Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments/amendment see the remark on page 6-9, filed on March 03, 2006, with respect to rejections of claims 1-16 have been fully considered and are persuasive. However, upon further consideration, a new ground of rejection is made on Mita et al (U.S. Patent 5,692,210), and further in view of Ochiai et al (U.S. Patent 6,340,973).

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mita et al (U.S. Patent 5,692,210), and further in view of Ochiai et al (U.S. Patent 6,340,973).

With regard to claim 1, Mita et al disclose a plurality of processors (please refer to item 1603, in Fig. 30, comprises multiple processors, also refer to col. 17, lines 62-67) processing respective portions of the same input image data (please refer to col. 2, lines 28-36, note that block selected from the same input image data) in parallel with each other (please refer to col. 2, lines 41-45) and outputting respective processed portions of said input image data (please refer to Fig. 39, note that the output from processor unit is input to memory); and

Page 3

an address memory (accepting) and storing address information related to a position of each portion of said input image data within said input image data for each respective portion of image data which have been processed by said plurality of processors (please refer to col. 2, lines 46-60 and also refer to col. 18, lines 1-8 and also ).

Mita et al did not disclose expressly for an address memory accepting process. However, at the same field of endeavor, Ochiai discloses this feature (please refer to col. 14, lines 28-37). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching Ochiai memory controlling process into Mita parallel processing system. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide controlling the memory so that the memory area in the memory is accessed according to the assess order optimized (please refer to col. 14, lines 38-49 of Ochiai). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ochiai with Mita to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

With regard to claim 2, Mita et al disclose an image memory storing said image data output from said plurality of processors (please refer to Fig. 30, items 1603 and 1602, the output from processors 1603 is stored in memory 1602, also refer to col. 17, lines 62-67), and read means reading (scanning) said image data from said image memory on the basis of said address information stored in said address memory (please refer to col. 18, lines 65-col. 19, lines 5).

With regard to claim 3, Mita et al disclose further comprising an image memory storing said image data output from said plurality of processors along the sequence of

Art Unit: 2624

addresses on the basis of said address information stored in said address memory (please refer to col. 19, lines 1-18).

With regard to claim 5, Mita et al disclose wherein said plurality of processors also output arrangement information corresponding to said processed portions of said image data (please refer to col. 19, lines 15-25).

# Allowable Subject Matter

- 3. Claims 6-16 are allowed.
- 4. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance. The closest prior art of record failed to teach or suggest, a first memory accepting and storing arrangement information in single image data for plurality of divided data arrangement information for each of said plurality of divided data being associated with whichever processor performs the prescribed processing of the divided data; and a controller restoring a single image from plurality of data processed in said plurality of processors in accordance with said arrangement information. Therefore, in combination with all the other limitations claims 6-16 are allowable.
- 5. Claims 4 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US Patent No. (6161208), (5129074), (5263003) and (5717946).

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to YOSEF KASSA whose telephone number is (571) 272-7452. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 AM to 6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JINGGE WU can be reached on (571) 272-7429. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300 for regular communication and (571) 273-8300 for after Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the customer service office whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Application/Control Number: 09/438,247

Art Unit: 2624

For more information about the PAIR system, see <a href="http://pair-direct.uspto.gov">http://pair-direct.uspto.gov</a>.

Page 6

Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the

Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

# PATENT EXAMINER

Yosef Kassa

05/18/06.